

After the State Department denial, Lee made public a letter of apology he received in 1961 from Secretary of State Rusk, deploring "improper activities." The Department then made a turnabout and admitted Rusk had sent the apology.

In the seamy world of intelligence, bribes go with spying and dirty work. There is nothing exceptional about that. But why do we have to go around bribing anti-Communists to lay off Communists?

ACLU Ignores Children's Rights, Say Clergy of Four Religions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1965

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, three clergymen of Staten Island, N. Y., Rabbi Benjamin Wykansky, Rev. Walter Everett, and Rt. Rev. John J. Cleary, are directors of Operation Richmond, a program which is fighting pornography in the Borough of Richmond, much the same as Operation Yorkville is fighting this menace in the Borough of Manhattan. The following article from the Tablet of August 19, 1965, sums up the position of the clergy of four religions in Operation Yorkville, and I am sure it speaks for the clergy of Staten Island, as well as the mature adult of our country.

Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include this article:

ACLU IGNORES CHILDREN'S RIGHTS, SAY CLERGY OF FOUR RELIGIONS

DEAR SIR: The American Civil Liberties Union should reexamine in its entirety its rigid, doctrinaire, and absolutist position on the first amendment. In fact, the citizenry in general should take the time to examine the ACLU position in all matters that affect children. For we are living in an era of totalitarian secularism, a secularism which is being forced upon our unprotected youth by a few who are highly skilled in the courts and in the propaganda arenas.

In the area of pornography, for example, which is recognizedly having a degenerative effect upon the mental and moral health of American children, the ACLU has consistently defended the pornographers rights under the first amendment, ignoring the rights and liberties of children and their parents. The director of the New York Civil Liberties Union admitted that the \$2 billion traffic in pornography could not exist without the union's defense of pornographers. The New York group carried a case to the State's highest court to have the one law which protected children from pornography invalidated as unconstitutional. They succeeded. When several replacement bills were introduced in the last session of the New York State Legislature, the New York Civil Liberties Union opposed all of them except one which was virtually unenforceable. A strong bill passed because of the concern of the great majority of the legislature.

The American Civil Liberties announced early this year that it would carry the appeal of convicted pornographer Ralph Ginsburg to the Supreme Court.

In keeping with its rigid reading of the first amendment, the ACLU is striving for the elimination of chaplains from the Armed Forces. Again youth are ignored. Young men dying in Vietnam, for example, would be denied the services of ministers of God.

The ACLU is working presently to have abortion laws invalidated, once more giving no thought to the innocent victim, the child still to be born.

Beginning September 21, with the blessing of the New York Board of Education, the ACLU will conduct a 16-week course for all city (grammar and high school) social science teachers. The course is entitled "Teaching the Principles of the Bill of Rights." In this way, New York children will be indoctrinated in the ACLU ideology of absolutism and concomitant secularism.

It would seem that the time is past due for examination and reexamination of the ACLU stand in terms of children.

Rabbi Dr. JULIUS G. NEUMANN,

Congregation Zichron Moshe.

Rev. WILLIAM T. WOOD, S.J.,

Pastor, St. Ignatius Loyola.

Rev. JOHN E. PALLAS,

Representative Greek Orthodox Arch-

diocese of North and South America.

Rev. JOHN SHINTAY,

Pastor, Lutheran Church.

MANHATTAN.

Federal Government and Michigan: Partners in Crime and Vice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1965

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell the Members of this House about the unfortunate partnership of the State of Michigan and the Federal Government in making Michigan gambling a mob monopoly. If the Michigan and Federal Governments would legalize and regulate gambling, its revenues could be made to work for the public good, but so long as they keep it illegal, and negligently allow the mob to reap the profits of illegal gambling, they will be partners in all the evil financed by mob gambling profits. So, by their ignorance, the governments in Lansing and Washington will be partners in maintaining a multitude of sins.

Gambling is big business in Michigan. Last year, the parimutual turnover came to \$174 million. Illegal gambling is more extensive. Offtrack betting was estimated before the McClullan committee to be about \$50 billion annually, and it was estimated that this was some 42 percent of the national illegal gambling total which would then be about \$120 billion. On a population basis, Michigan's share of this amount would be \$5.04 billion annually. The 10 percent of this turnover that stays in syndicate treasuries will finance a lot of crime. That 10 percent makes the joint negligence of the governments in Lansing and Washington worth about a half billion a year to the underworld. If this seems far fetched, it should be remembered that a Massachusetts commission 10 years ago found more money gambled in that State than

spent on groceries, and the Justice Department estimates that the world gambling profits at \$11 billion a year nationally.

If Michigan would face up to the moral facts of life, it would cease to be a feeding trough for organized crime and gambling. Our States and Nation need Government controlled and operated gambling to make gambling profits work for and not against the people. The best mechanism is a lottery.

The War in Vietnam and Christian Conscience

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN G. DOW

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1965

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, the rector of my church in Nyack, N. Y., has raised some questions about Vietnam in a recent message to our congregation. When many voices are being heard, certainly the voice of a churchman cannot be ignored. I submit the message from Rev. George F. Regas, rector of Grace Episcopal Church:

THE WAR IN VIETNAM AND CHRISTIAN CONSCIENCE

The night before Franklin D. Roosevelt died in Warm Springs, Ga., he was planning a trip to San Francisco to attend the organization of the United Nations. He was working on his speech when the stroke came—and these are the last words he ever wrote:

"Today we are faced with the preeminent fact that, if civilization is to survive, we must cultivate the science of human relationships—the ability of all people, of all kinds, to live together and work together in the same world, at peace. As we go forward toward the greatest contribution that any generation of human beings can make in the world—the contribution of lasting peace—I ask you to keep up your faith."

I must admit I find it difficult to keep up my faith in man's ability to establish a lasting peace. Why? Because it seems easier to gain support for the arms race and military solutions to our political problems than to challenge America and the free world to create real alternatives to communism and provide imaginative leadership that will supply the basic ingredients to lasting peace. "The guns and bombs, the rockets and warships are all symbols of human failure." "A world where every country can shape its own destiny . . . will never be built by bombs and bullets." "The only path for reasonable men is the path of peaceful settlement." One catches his breath when he realizes that President Johnson spoke these words on April 7, 1965. Nevertheless, it is now quite obvious that the war in South Vietnam against the Vietcong is an American war. What a momentous decision it was to commit the United States to a land war of steadily growing proportions in Asia. This staggering decision has been made without Senate debate. "The greatest deliberative body in the world is abdicated responsibility" because most men in Washington feel it too dangerous to criticize the war in Vietnam. They fear the cry of "appeasement of communism." Unless we can have an open forum across this great land where honest and sincere men and

women can debate the issues of peace, then there is little hope.

I have no technical competence in this field of international peace and I will leave military strategy and protocol to the experts. Yet I refuse to believe that there is nothing a Christian can say about the war. A minister is entrusted with a dynamic Gospel in a dangerous world and he must struggle to see its relevance. The souls and lives of all mankind are at stake.

The church must hold up Christ Jesus and somehow let Him speak to a world engulfed in strife and turmoil. What then does the Christian conscience say?

I do not think it says that we must withdraw from Vietnam immediately, no matter what. The Christian conscience opposes totalitarianism because it suppresses the life and spirit of man. The Christian wants America to seek the development of open, responsible societies with liberty and justice for all. So total abandonment of Vietnam is unacceptable.

Once this is said, I hasten to add that the Christian conscience should be against gambling on the possibility of a military solution on the problem in Vietnam. The press gives every indication that it is going to get worse—more cruelty, suffering and killing of men, women, and children. The hell of war has come again and the rain of fiery death is being poured out on a helpless peasantry who have been victimized by other people's wars for decades. And as we fight we support a military regime in South Vietnam that makes a mockery of democratic government. I am not a pacifist, but my Christian conscience stands condemned by what is happening in Vietnam. Let us be honest and admit our mistakes and work for an immediate cease-fire—even at the cost of substantial compromise. And as we sit at the conference table, let us have China present and all other groups who are aiding the conflict.

And more must be said by the Christian conscience: we must launch at once a major effort to heal and rebuild that wounded land of Asia. We must help provide real alternatives to communism. If we would commit our great world leadership to this course, then there would be a rebirth of faith in man's ability to establish a lasting peace. Cannot some of our politicians and our national leaders challenge us to give our energies and imagination, our sacrifice and blood, our patriotism and loyalty to the programs of healing as we have given them to the programs of destruction? For God's sake and the sake of all that is precious in humanity, let us pay the cost of peace—high as it may be. Let voices be raised in Congress that Americans become the peacemakers—feeding the hungry, clothing and housing the refugees, reaching out to help all victims of misery and removing the causes of injustice and tensions among men; so that men no longer have reason to fight one another. For the first time in history we have the knowledge and resources to transform the conditions of life on earth. We could build a new world of peace—and the dream of the centuries would be within our reach. Naive—you say. But we've never tried it; yet the methods of war and violence have always failed.

Christian people, let the spirit of Christ speak to us and through us to the Nation. Retaliation, killing, and cruelty—evil for evil—are not God's way. Somehow we must break the vicious cycle by dealing with our enemies with love and good deeds.

Pray. Think. Speak. Join others over the country who out of the Judeo-Christian faith have written to the White House: "Mr. President, we plead with you with the utmost urgency to turn our Nation's course before it is too late from cruelty to com-

passion, from destruction to healing, from peace to justice.

GEORGE F. REGAS.

Upper Michigan—Part III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND F. CLEVENGER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1965

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, some of the most dramatic proof that our Great Society is already giving us a greater society in which all Americans will be able to equally participate is found in reports on Project Head Start.

More than 1,100 underprivileged children in my upper Michigan district were enrolled in Head Start classes this summer. This program enlisted the help of 95 professional instructors and more than 300 cooperating citizens.

Until Project Head Start these nearly 1,200 preschool youngsters would have been destined to enter public schools as underdogs in the competition for knowledge. But no longer. Head Start has given them the head start they need to begin on an equal footing with youngsters from more fortunate families.

The story of Head Start in upper Michigan is extremely well told in the following article by Richard Bird in the Escanaba, Mich., Daily Press:

[From the Escanaba (Mich.) Daily Press, Sept. 8, 1965]

HEAD START IN UPPER PENINSULA FAVORED AS CONTINUING AID

(By Richard Bird)

With Labor Day past, the school year has begun in earnest throughout the Upper Peninsula. Among the children entering kindergarten this year are those who participated in Project Head Start in the summer. Teachers will begin to determine to their own satisfaction whether the controversial program was a success.

Project Head Start was designed to prepare preschool children of limited opportunity and from low-income families to cope more successfully with the regular school program. Emphasis was on developing the children socially, preparing them medically, and widening their range of concepts.

Head Start was provided for by the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, basis of the Federal antipoverty program. Financing of up to 90 percent of the cost was specified, with the rest to be provided locally. Programs were run in most areas in the Upper Peninsula.

Who were the Head Start children in the Upper Peninsula? Were they the children who could most benefit from such a program? What was accomplished that could not have been accomplished in a regular school program? How did the parents react? Should the program be conducted again?

To find answers to these and other questions, UPCAP (Upper Peninsula Committee for Area Progress) sent me to visit the Upper Peninsula operations. I talked with school superintendents, program directors, teachers and assistants, and volunteers who ranged from mothers of the children to fourth grade school students.

FIRST TOOTHBRUSH

More than 600 children varied in background. There were 4-year-old children who did not know what a toothbrush was when given one. They had never owned toothbrushes. There were children who had no water in their homes and who were fascinated by the soap when given showers. There were children whose brothers and sisters had come to school in the winter, wearing rubbers, but no shoes—or jackets, but no shirts. There were children who came in from the woods and who had never seen a flush toilet before.

One of the questions asked Head Start children for testing was, "What day do we go to church?" One teacher reported that several times she got back the answer, "clothes," because the families of the children had been given free clothes at church. When asked if these conditions reflected apathy on the part of the parents, the Head Start directors said no. Most parents are concerned about their children, they said.

Superintendent Carl Kleimola, director of the Wakefield Township Head Start, said that in his area the problem was peoples' resistance to moving to another area, when lumbering and mining declined. He said that many men are commuting between the Ironwood area and the White Pine mine, 50 miles away, to work.

Principal Arthur G. Quinn, director of the Newberry Head Start, cited cases in his area of people being brought in as woodcutters during the lumber boom. When the decline came, the companies pulled out and the people were stranded.

NOT ALL DEPRIVED

Not all the children, however, were from economically deprived families. Although Head Start was primarily designed for children from families with an annual income of less than \$3,000, the Office of Economic Opportunity said that "family income need not be a specific requirement for admission, as long as the program is primarily reaching the poor within the neighborhood."

In this way, a child whose father had a reasonably good income, but 17 children was allowed to participate. A mother had had trouble with other children in the family, so she asked that her child be allowed in the program. The wife of a department store manager wanted their child in the program, because he was an only child. She felt he needed exposure to other children in a sharing situation. The teachers felt this interaction was necessary so that when the children of low-income families entered kindergarten, they would not find themselves in a primarily strange peer group.

Teachers in the Head Start programs were generally enthusiastic about its accomplishments. The average number of children in a class was 18. Each teacher had at least one assistant. The small class size, coupled with the loosely structured program, allowed the teachers to give much more individual attention than is possible in the regular school programs.

As might be expected, shyness was the main problem of the children. One boy was so shy that his mother had to carry him in the first day and sneak out after the teacher had gotten his attention. It was the 4th week before he would finally take a job, that of turning out the lights at the end of the period. In the 7th week, he participated fully, making a paper clown with the rest of the children.

STILL BEHIND

The teacher said, "He is still behind, but how would he have been in kindergarten if he had not had this individual attention in Head Start?" In some cases older brothers and sisters of shy children were asked to come in to help draw the children out. This could not have been done in kindergarten.

high in minerals in its lower area. The excess salinity of Colorado River water delivered to Mexico under treaty would be reduced, removing a periodic source of international friction. To create NAWAPA it would be necessary only to do what we have done many times before, but on a much grander scale."

NAWAPA would create tens of thousands of jobs. It would directly benefit scores of industries. It would require \$5 billion in construction equipment and tools, 100,000 tons of copper and aluminum, 30 million tons of steel, and \$25 billion in labor. It is calculated to provide western North America with adequate water for the next 100 years.

But there are many obstacles. Premier W. A. C. Bennett, of British Columbia, is against exporting water to the United States. Some fear ruin for the Columbia River salmon industry. In a letter to the magazine Science, which has lauded the project, a Canadian wrote: "May we suggest instead that it would be more logical for the people to move where the water is? * * * We would be glad to welcome you to our invigorating climate. Please bring your industries with you."

But if we can negotiate with anybody, we should be able to do so with Canada and Mexico. Senator FRANK MOSS, of Utah, chairman of a Senate subcommittee that has made a preliminary study of NAWAPA feels it may rank in importance with the Louisiana Purchase in the development of the West. "It is not only completely feasible," he says, "it is almost inevitable."

Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard Business Rises to \$70 Million

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1965

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, the island State of Hawaii is once again meeting the challenge of our times and proving its economic and strategic value to our country. The current crisis in Vietnam has created a need that only Hawaii could meet adequately. During the last fiscal year the naval shipyard at Pearl Harbor overhauled 52 ships, modernized 2 destroyers and performed emergency repair work on ships en route to Vietnam.

A summary of the work being accomplished by Hawaii's Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard is found in the following article which appeared in the Honolulu Star Bulletin of August 17, 1965:

NAVY SHIPYARD BUSINESS RISES TO \$70 MILLION

The State's largest industrial employer did nearly \$70 million worth of business during the fiscal year ended June 30, up \$5,700,000 from a year earlier.

Rear Adm. E. Alvey Wright, commander of Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard, said the upturn was due principally to overhaul work on submarines, and emergency repair work on ships en route to Vietnam.

Wright said the work pace should remain brisk and possibly increase in the months ahead.

In order to meet this workload, the work force is being expanded by 500 workers during the current fiscal year.

There are openings for engineers, marine machinists, pipefitters, and machinists, Wright announced.

He hopes most of these needed skills can come from people already living in Hawaii. During the past year, the shipyard overhauled 52 destroyers, submarines, and service force ships of the Pacific Fleet.

Two World War II vintage destroyers were modernized to meet the needs of modern warfare during the year, and more than \$700,000 was spent to retrain a large segment of the shipyard's work force.

This was necessary, Wright commented, to keep abreast of the technological improvements in nuclear submarines and guided missile ships.

Last year's shipyard payroll was \$40 million and more than \$2 million in supplies and services was purchased from numerous island business firms, making the shipyard a major contributor to the local economy.

In addition, \$650,000 of naval ship repair work was contracted to commercial shipyards and industrial companies in Hawaii.

cent of the population of South Vietnam. We cannot begin too early to plan to win the peace in Vietnam. And we must be prepared for the cost to us this will take.

I spent last year as a student in the neighboring Republic of the Philippines. I learned something very important there. We, as Americans, must be primarily concerned about other nationals as the people they are, and not just as they relate to us—whether Filipinos, Vietnamese, Dominicans, Chinese, or whoever they are. If we would have that attitude, we would learn just what the problems others have really are, and we could help significantly.

Urging you to do your utmost in this area, I am,

Sincerely,

ROBERT R. VON OEYEN, JR.

American Legion Defends Otto Otepka; Denounces State Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1965

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the American Legion in its recent national convention in Portland, Oreg., is to be commended for the resolution it adopted denouncing the State Department for its persecution of Otto Otepka, chief security evaluator for that Department of Government.

At the same time the Legion commended the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee for its thorough investigation of the Otepka case and bringing to the attention of the public the facts concerning the persecution of this dedicated Government employee.

Otepka, in his long battle against the perjurers and others in the State Department, has had the support of past National Commander Don Johnson of the American Legion, and the resolution makes it clear that the Legion will tolerate no undermining of the Nation's security through attacks upon loyal citizens, and in this case a trusted security officer.

The resolution follows:

THE 47TH ANNUAL NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE AMERICAN LEGION, PORTLAND, OREG., AUGUST 24-26, 1965

Whereas Mr. Otto F. Otepka, Chief, Division of Evaluations, Department of State Office of Security, for the past 4 years has been subjected—on the part of his superiors in the Department—to undue duress, harassment, insults, and threat of dismissal; and

Whereas on September 23, 1963, Mr. Otepka was advised that the Department proposed to remove him from his appointment with the Department of State on charges that he had violated Department directives governing classified documents, specifically, that he had furnished certain classified documents to the chief counsel, U.S. Senate Internal Security Subcommittee; and

Whereas Mr. Otepka met these charges, and appealed the dismissal notice, on grounds that the documents in question were turned over to the Senate subcommittee—then conducting an investigation of the administration of the Internal Security Act—in order to establish the verity of his testimony to the subcommittee, concerning lax security prac-

Letter on Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WESTON E. VIVIAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1965

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, I have received many, many letters from constituents, in the past 8 months, concerning the grave and vexing problems which this country faces in Vietnam. But I have received none more sensible and more compelling, I think, than one from Mr. Robert R. von Oeyen, Jr., of Lambertville, in the Second Congressional District of Michigan, which I am privileged to represent.

I would like to share Mr. von Oeyen's letter with my colleagues, and place it at this point in the RECORD:

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE VIVIAN: Unfortunately, those of us who support a certain aspect of Government policy very seldom make that support known. Despite how your mail may be running, I'm sure you realize that most of us support the President insofar as the war effort in Vietnam is concerned. Very few of us like the situation—but most of us know that the present military policy in Vietnam is necessary not only for the well-being of the South Vietnamese whose Government invited us to help them, but for the well-being of all southeast Asia.

Most of us (I hope) also realize that the situation in Vietnam is caused by both nationalism, and international communism, which is the socioeconomic, political, and religious moving force behind the nationalists who are the Vietcong. Their relation to North Vietnam and indirectly to China is obvious. The Vietcong may eventually be beaten by U.S. military might and the troops of South Vietnam. But, and this is most important, the problems which caused them to seek a Communist solution will still exist. These must be solved—for the well-being of the South Vietnamese, and ultimately for the well-being of the United States. To solve these problems a program of reform—socioeconomic as well as political—is vital. This may entail a certain degree of Government socialism supported by a large amount of U.S. aid. Just what must be done is a very difficult problem that must be thoroughly investigated, taking into account religious differences, the sad tendency toward strongman rule, the unnatural split between North and South Vietnam, and, most especially the plight of the peasant who makes up 85 per-

A5178

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

September 14, 1965

tices in the Department of State, as opposed to contrary evidence offered the committee by his superiors; and

Whereas the documents in question upheld Mr. Otepka's testimony, and subsequent hearings by the subcommittee brought out the fact that certain of his superiors and other employees of the Office of Security had otherwise misled or misinformed the Senate subcommittee; and

Whereas the code of ethics for Government service, expressed in House-Senate Concurrent Resolution 175, 85th Congress, 2d session, requires that any person in Government service: "Put loyalty to the highest moral principles and to country above loyalty to person, party or Government department;" and

Whereas the American Legion insists that the security program of the State Department be of the highest possible order; and

Whereas the Otepka case involves not only loyalty to the United States, it also involves the matter of the dignity of an individual human being; and

Whereas at stake in Mr. Otepka's appeal is (a) whether or not dedicated professional security officers in Government will be permitted to be so intimidated in the conduct of their vital work that the U.S. internal security program will be placed in jeopardy; and (b) whether or not the Congress—consisting of the elected representatives of the people—will preserve its right to oversee the behavior of officials in the executive branch: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the American Legion in national convention assembled in Portland, Oreg., August 24-26, 1965, That the American Legion deploras the treatment which Mr. Otto F. Otepka has received at the hands of his superiors in the U.S. Department of State, and commends the action of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee in its thorough investigation of the Otepka case and related matters, and in its bringing to the attention of the public the true circumstances surrounding Mr. Otepka's dismissal from his important position in the Department of State.

Land Reform, American Style

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1965

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, refreshing news came to my desk in the form of an editorial written by William J. Kuhfuss, president of the Illinois Agricultural Association. It reported the substantial land reform that has occurred in the United States in the last 30 years. Today, only 20 percent of America's farms are owned by someone other than the operator. This compares with 42 percent 30 years ago.

Text of the editorial follows:

LAND REFORM, AMERICAN STYLE

In many countries of the world, land reform has accompanied the struggle for progress or survival. The feudal system eventually invites unrest. Land was owned by a wealthy few and farmed by a peasant many. In land reform, would-be benevolent governments take land from those who own it and give it in small parcels to those who have none. In some cases, ownership is

given, but usually only the right to farm is given.

Mr. Abdu El Hasson, chief administrator of agricultural reform in Syria, recently visiting Illinois, is administering this privilege to farm in his country. In 1958, land reform was activated. The government took over all land. Large landholders were reduced to 80 hectares (2.47 acres per hectare) to operate. In 1963, the 80 hectares were reduced to 50 hectares. The would-be farmers with no land were given 10 hectares. If the job of farming does not suit the government inspector, the farmer loses his right to farm. This is typical centralized control and social reform.

The American system has been basically different. We have prospered by preserving a man's right to earn, own, and direct. Under this system we have been experiencing a kind of land reform—American style.

Thirty years ago, 42 percent of the land in the United States was owned by a landlord and farmed by a tenant. Today, only 20 percent of America's farms are owned by someone other than the operator.

With ownership and control must go responsibility. The dynamics and success of the American economy would indicate that a reasonable balance of responsibility has been exercised. Over-accumulations of capital have been retarded by taxation. Redistribution of wealth in America does take place. All too often the phrase, "shirt sleeves to shirt sleeves in three generations" truly illustrates redistribution does take place.

The farmer has improved his lot in America over the lot of farmers anywhere in the world and, while doing so, has improved America's lot. He has been free to earn, own, and direct. He has also been free to fail. In countries where land reform has been imposed, all farmers are guaranteed to be peasants forever. We do not want this kind of a guarantee in America.

People and methods change, truth and principles never do. As citizens, we each share the responsibility of preserving the American way.

Excessive Power of the Executive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1965

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I do see hobgoblins—I do see a very definite and dangerous threat to individual liberties in the abdication of its constitutionally given powers by the Congress and its total submission to one-man rule. I am one who is bothered by the "remarkable concentration of power" in the Executive.

Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the September 7, 1965, edition of the Wall Street Journal presents a frightening thesis—is this generation, indeed, going "to bequeath in turn a legacy whereby a citizen is secure in his liberty only at the whim of the Executive."

Every Member of Congress should read—and heed—this editorial. Mr. Speaker. So should President Johnson. But, more importantly, it should be read by every citizen of the United States.

The editorial follows:

A BITTER LEGACY

It is often said that Lyndon Johnson wields more power than any other President, at least in a time of less-than-full-scale war. The striking thing is that this remarkable concentration of power apparently bothers so few people.

The concern is not necessarily or only about how Mr. Johnson himself uses the power. Apart from the fact that he is rapidly adding to it through the expansion of the Executive, he impresses most of the Nation as a man of restraint. More troubling is the meaning for the future, since it is plain that the country would be in deep difficulty if a man of dictatorial bent were ever elected, what with so much authority already embedded in the Office.

An answer to that, perhaps, is that in such a circumstance Congress would rise up and if necessary impeach the man; we still do have the machinery to prevent or correct excesses. Yet a major reason for the rise of the Executive is that Congress has for decades permitted a steady erosion of its responsibilities and prerogatives.

Moreover, there is no diminution in the incessant clamor of special interests for still further extensions of the Federal Government, which is to say the power of the Presidency. It is almost unbelievable but unfortunately the case that this Federal mystique has grown by leaps and bounds—an insistence, contrary to all experience, that Federal authority can solve problems where others have failed.

A relatively small but revealing case in point: With prodigious lack of foresight, local politicians in New York City and other places in the Northeast neglected to assure sufficient water supplies to withstand a drought. Discomfort is here and now, disaster impends; finally, appeals were dispatched to Washington.

The administration, in response, decrees New York City and other sections to be disaster areas (the government of the city is a disaster, that is for sure) and extends financial aid. How much good it will do is debatable, but it is one more Federal intrusion that would have been entirely unnecessary had there been elementary competence at the local level.

Thus the localities, the States, the special interests reach out to Washington; at the same time the Federal officials exercise all the ingenuity at their command in figuring out new areas to invade, new responsibilities to take over. It is a formidable interaction repeated over and over, in endless variety and in ever widening circles, and coupled with the complacency of Congress, it is building a Presidential force against which there seems no effective countervailing power.

Even this very evident buildup does not so far as can be judged, excite any great worry or even interest; those who suggest a possible threat to liberties in the process are accused of seeing hobgoblins.

If there is indeed no danger, it may be asked why the architects of this Government took such extraordinary pains to prevent the emergence of a tyrant and to bind down each Federal branch in the chains of the Constitution. They, at any rate, knew that governments easily degenerate into dictatorships. The development should be still less mysterious to people of the totalitarian-scarred 20th century.

Whether practical political means of redressing the balance any longer exist, we would hesitate to venture; certainly they are hard to visualize. But that difficulty does not excuse anyone, least of all Congress, from looking at what is happening and considering what recourse might be feasible.

It would be a bitter outcome if this generation, legatees of free institutions, were to

If I had to give the younger generation a label, I would call them, as the President has, Volunteer Generation. I may not always agree with the causes they serve, but I must always admire the spirit with which they fight. It could shame some of us older people who pride ourselves on being concerned citizens.

HOW FAR?

For example, a poll in a national news magazine asked American students how far they would go—beyond mere talk—to support a cause in which they believed. Some 93 percent said they would sign a petition; 72 percent had already done so. Some 87 percent said they would contribute money; 58 percent had already done so. An amazing 43 percent were even ready to go to jail.

More than 10,000 young volunteers are now serving in the Peace Corps. Another 3,000 have already returned after tours of duty. But most significant, more than 100,000 have asked to take part in this bold and idealistic experiment. When VISTA (Volunteers in Service to America—the domestic Peace Corps) was launched, more than 3,000 inquiries were received from young people on the first day of business.

When Parade's own editor, Jess Gorkin, had the inspired idea to ask the young people of America to "Work a Day for J.F.K.," the response was staggering. They went out by the thousands to mow lawns, clean cars, run errands, sell cookies and lemonade so they could donate their earnings to the John F. Kennedy Memorial Library. There was no compulsion such as is brought by the Commissars in a Communist society. It was merely a suggestion in one magazine for young people to accept or reject.

All it takes to rouse today's young people is motivation. They need to know that their contribution has a purpose. I grew up when it was important to help the family. It was important that we dug vegetables out of the sand and stored them in the root cellar. It was important that we earned money to help feed the family. Now in our prosperous suburbs, it is no longer important for young people to contribute to the livelihood. They are inclined to look upon the daily chores as merely an exercise in discipline.

I have complete faith in our young generation. Whenever I am weary or worried, I seek out young people. Many times, I have walked out of a meeting, depressed and discouraged, looking for some teenagers. I have found them to be a tonic; they rekindle my spirit and sharpen my wits. I am able to go back refreshed and revitalized.

We parents expect the young to learn from us and from their teachers. But this holds good only if we are prepared to learn from the young—to probe their problems and to admit, as history has proven time and again, that the "foolies" of today can be the truths of tomorrow.

WE MAY WIN THE WAR BUT LOSE THE PEOPLE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, James Reston of the New York Times writes in the Sunday magazine section of the Times some refreshing and persuasive observations on the Vietnamese war which he has been observing at first hand in South Vietnam.

Among other things Mr. Reston says that the mood and attitude of American officials in Vietnam is quite different than the mood and attitude in this country. For instance, in Vietnam the view is that talk of negotiations now may be very harmful to us in Vietnam. It can be interpreted as a sign of weakness, as a reason for the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese to hold out longer,

press harder, feel more confidence in their eventual victory. Reston also reports a reassuring observation about the competence and ability of our forces in Vietnam, and how well our forces have established a military defense that will not be defeated militarily.

At the same time, Reston also observes that we could lose. In all probability the loss would not be a military loss but a loss resulting from our losing the support of the people. On the economic front, the social, psychological front we are in grave, serious danger. This relatively unreported front is where we must continue to fight and win.

I ask unanimous consent that the article by Mr. Reston "We May Win the War But Lose the People," be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE MAY WIN THE WAR BUT LOSE THE PEOPLE
(By James Reston)

SAIGON.—The face of the war is not the same in Saigon as in Washington. It may look the same, like the face of a clock in different time zones, but it is noon in Washington when it is midnight in Saigon.

Time and distance make a difference. The mood of American officials here is not at all the same as the mood of their colleagues in Washington. They worry about different things, but on the whole the Americans here worry less and are more optimistic about the future than when they left the Potomac.

This may be because they are under fire. Bombs have a way of making people pay attention to the urgencies of the present, but there are other more tangible reasons.

First, the performance of the American military forces here is impressive. They have demonstrated already that they can cross half the world with their bulldozers, their engineering skills, their air and naval power; and establish bases quickly under tropical conditions in the face of a well-trained and ingenious foe. They hold limited points in a limited area mainly on the seacoast, but at least they have removed the fear that the American command might be overrun before it could be securely established.

"The trained American," General Eisenhower wrote in 1948, "possesses qualities that are almost unique. Because of his initiative and resourcefulness, his adaptability to change, and his readiness to resort to the expedient, he becomes, when he has attained a proficiency in all the normal techniques of battle, a most formidable soldier." There has been a lot of evidence to support this conclusion—at least enough to give the American community here a sense of confidence that the short-term problem of the war can be met.

Second, there is a growing feeling in Saigon that the Vietcong cannot organize large enough units in the face of constant harassment from the air to win a major victory over regimental sized units of the American forces. And even if they did manage to get together a large enough force to risk it, the armed helicopter can now bring reinforcements to the battle much faster than the enemy can.

Even the French observers here, who are not given to wild exaggeration of America's capabilities, are impressed by this new mobile power of the armed helicopter. They point to it as one of the major advantages the Americans have over the French Army when it was dealing with the same problem.

Third, the Vietcong are showing some signs of feeling pressure under fire. They

have been conscripting 16-year-olds and 17-year-olds and sending them far from home in spite of promises to the contrary, and often with insufficient training. They have been increasing their exactions from the peasants, often taking as much as two-thirds of the rice crop. Also, unlike their disciplined actions of the past when they sought to win over the civilian population, some of their units have recently engaged in brutalities designed to terrorize the civil populations, and in some areas their actions have amounted to little more than a form of armed banditry.

Finally, as the United States has stabilized the military situation and gone over to the initiative in the air, it has begun to get more cooperation and intelligence from the people.

The authority of the white man may be gone in Asia, but respect for power has not. In fact, respect for power is evident in every traffic jam at every corner in Saigon.

The Vietnamese have an almost hierarchical system of power in these streets, and everybody pushes his power to the last millimeter. The pedestrian—even the dainty female pedestrian, tiptoeing around the puddles in her angle-length pantaloons, has to give way to the bicycle, while the bicycle defers at the very last critical instant to the scooter, and the scooter to the little blue-and-yellow Renault taxi, and the taxi to the jeep, and the jeep to the truck.

These local factors undoubtedly contribute to the short-term optimism here. Other local factors also give Americans in this capital a way of looking at the war that is somewhat different from Washington's.

The military strategy, for example, affects the thinking here about a negotiated settlement. Defensively, this strategy is to hunt the Vietcong from the air. Offensively, the purpose is to drive the Vietcong into the forests and deny them time to rest and replenish their supplies in the hamlets.

American diplomats here, unlike their colleagues in Washington, are counting, not on bringing the enemy to a big splashy peace or truce conference, but on forcing the Vietcong gradually to fade away or reduce their actions to manageable proportions, so that the job of pacifying South Vietnam and establishing a stable responsible government can make some progress. Meanwhile, General Westmoreland is working on a plan to encourage the defection of Vietcong troops by promising them safe conduct back to their native hamlets. But nobody here is talking about negotiations in order to placate public opinion in the United States.

It is opinion in Vietnam that officials here are worrying about. I have not found a single official, either in the American community in Saigon or the diplomatic community here, who thought the constant appeals for negotiations out of Washington were helpful. Most of them were for a negotiated settlement in the end, but felt this was a function of private diplomacy and insisted that the way to avoid negotiations was to keep talking about them publicly.

The best judgment here seems to be that it will take a year—some of our experts think two—to produce a sharp decrease in Vietcong raids. This raises a central question about American strategy. For while the short-run outlook here seems fairly good, the long-run prospect is quite different and much more complicated. Officials here are constantly coming up against the question: Will the Vietcong crack under the steady American bombardment and the power of the helicopters, or will the social and political structure of South Vietnam crack first?

The war has already produced more than half a million refugees. Feeding and housing them alone is an immense problem that is not being done with any sense of pity, or even decency, and the air war is just beginning.

By the end of this year, American air power will have doubled at the very least—a

September 14, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

22957

plant wished to continue their union membership. Affronted by this challenge to its position, the union suspended the petitioner's membership and, for good measure, fined him \$500, the fine later being withdrawn.

In turn the employee appealed to the NLRB, charging that his union was interfering with his right to file a decertification petition. The NLRB dismissed his complaint, on the ground that since such petitions are of serious "union concern," the unions must be able to protect themselves by penalizing employees who file them.

To be sure, any move to decertify a union as the workers' bargaining agency is of "union concern"—especially when to date about two-thirds of all decertification elections have been lost by the challenged unions. But in its eagerness to protect unions against collapse the NLRB shows an almost incredible lack of concern for the welfare of the individual member and for his right to determine whether or not the union in fact represents a majority voice.

By coincidence, Congress now seems close to repealing section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, a move that would invalidate State right-to-work laws that protect employees against compulsory unionism. The NLRB's sanction of union coercion should, at the very least, persuade the lawmakers to take another look at what they are asked to endorse.

THE VICE PRESIDENT'S FAITH IN AMERICAN YOUTH

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, at a time when America's youth are frequently under sharp criticism, it is refreshing to read of the faith which our Vice President, HUBERT HUMPHREY, has in our young men and women.

The Vice President has set forth this faith in an inspiring article, which appears in the September 5, 1965, issue of *Parade* magazine.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the *Record* at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the *Record*, as follows:

WHAT'S RIGHT WITH TODAY'S YOUTH—SOME RIOT; OTHERS DO GOOD DEEDS—THE VICE PRESIDENT LOOKS AT OUR CONTROVERSIAL YOUNGER GENERATION

(By HUBERT H. HUMPHREY)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Young Americans give their lives for freedom in South Vietnam, while other young Americans demonstrate against our involvement there. Some young people rip apart seaside resorts, others work night and day to repair the flood-ravaged dikes of the Middle West. Our universities turn out the brightest, best-educated graduates in history, but at the same time we face a problem of school dropouts.

Which is the true picture of the younger generation? Are more and more young people finding their release in rioting, protests and crime? Or is the trend upward toward honor and achievement? Will they send America into decline, or will they build a greater, more dynamic nation?

I believe the latter is true, and I can back up my belief with facts and personal experience. This is no reason for complacency. For we cannot allow even a fraction of our youth to squander themselves while we, who like to boast that we are older and wiser, stand by lamenting.

My interest in youth is by no means academic. As the father of four children (three still in school), I am concerned at the increase in juvenile crime not only in the

slums, where there is the goad of dismal poverty, but among children who have never known want, children who should know better.

Like any other father of my generation, I have my share of skepticism about Beatle mops and dances like the swim, the frog, and the watusi. But then I find myself asking: Was there ever a young generation that didn't have crazes, and was there ever an old one that approved of them? What of the flappers of the Roaring Twenties, many of them now sedate grandmothers? What of the grandfathers who once sported Rudolph Valentino sideburns and those wide trousers known as Oxford bags? What about the Black Bottom and the Charleston? But we grew out of them.

I do not condone the excesses of youth. I don't mean the fads; I mean the rioting, violence, and crime that cause us worry in our society. But again, I must ask how much we, the older generation, are responsible for the startling increase in juvenile lawlessness?

The war broke up families and reduced parental discipline. Then came the postwar years of the "fast buck" with an inevitable eroding of morality and family responsibility. Children were left to bring themselves up while their parents made up for lost time.

Now we are in a period of unprecedented prosperity, and I cannot help feeling that prosperity is a more severe test of character than adversity. Hard times, as I remember from my own youth, bring families together. In good times, it is all too easy to drift apart. Though the young people today enjoy luxuries never known to their parents, they are also exposed to pressures and frustrations their parents never encountered.

MORE PEOPLE THAN JOBS

Our youth are quite conscious they live in a world that has the capacity to destroy itself and that the detonators are in the hands of the older generation. They are also conscious of the fact that, in our affluent society, there are more people of their age than there are jobs to go around. The number of workers 18 and 19 years old is expected to increase by half a million this year—twice the increase of last year. Before 1970, more than 3 million young people will swell the labor force each year.

Those without training and skills will face a bleak future. The unemployment rate for the young already is more than three times as high as for older workers. We are past the time when a living, even a humble one, can be made without anything but willing hands.

Our country does not owe anybody a living, but it does owe its youth at least the opportunity to work. Government and private industry are now alert to this problem, and we are doing everything we can to help these young people. There are youth opportunity centers, the poverty program, the Job Corps, the Neighborhood Youth Corps, the community action programs.

Of course, youth must be willing to work, and most of them are. I have spoken to thousands of young people at Job Corps camps and other training centers. Many come from broken homes; many are barely able to read and write. Almost all have been bitterly disappointed in their short lives. Yet most are determined to pick up their second chance, acquire new skills and face the world with hope.

Even more impressive are the thousands of young Americans who have an acute conscience about their own generation and want to help the less fortunate. They are intelligent, courageous, well-informed young people, willing to work long hours for little or no pay to correct what they feel is injustice.

Some of the student protests, picketing, marches, sit-ins have caused dismay among us older folk. Frankly, I have shared it because some of the issues, in my view, have been false. But I must admit that America today might be a better place if the people of my generation had shown the same awareness. Flery speeches and angry placards on the campus are to my mind far less dangerous to the Nation's future than the silence that stifles new ideas. Age in itself is no guarantee of wisdom. In a world changing as rapidly as ours, there can be as many old fools as young fools. Young Americans who get into trouble, who kick against the established order, are often the most alert.

Who of our older generation has not been a rebel? I have been one, and so has our President. Lyndon Johnson was a school dropout who left his native Texas to work with his hands in the fields of California. But he returned to enter college and begin his career as a teacher in a Mexican-American public school. His former students still remember him as a man who gave them knowledge and encouragement to face a world that all too often seemed stacked against them.

Lyndon Johnson held his first Presidential appointment at 27, his first political office at 29. He has said: "No one knows better than I the fires that burn in the hearts of young men who yearn for the chance to do better what they see their elders doing not well * * * or not doing at all."

FAMOUS BEATNIKS

Today's young people—as students, as citizens, yes, even as demonstrators—are showing that they, too, want to do better. Of course, we have our beatniks. There have been beatniks in every age. Some of them are now listed among the world's leading artists, writers and musicians. Gauguin was a beatnik. So were Van Gogh and Edgar Allan Poe.

But I am less concerned with the eccentricities of genius, which can flower in the most unlikely soil, than I am with the mass of our young people today. I don't find them a "beat" generation at all, and I have met them by the thousands across this great country.

Our young people are a healthy and wholesome generation, less hypocritical, more frank than we were at their age. They speak more openly about sex, religion, politics, and other subjects that used to be taboo. In the age of computers, satellites, and almost instant communications, they are also more intelligent and competent. For this is the age of excellence.

Not long ago, I visited the nuclear aircraft carrier *Enterprise* and was amazed to find boys under 20 manning consoles of multi-million-dollar radar equipment. They were responsible for the safety of American pilots and million-dollar aircraft miles away at sea. At Loring Air Force Base, I talked with a grease-stained enlisted man whom I found working under a jet plane. "I understand you are pretty good," I said, "at keeping these planes in tiptop shape."

"No, Mr. Vice President," the GI replied. "We're not pretty good. We're the best." His commanding officer, Brig. Gen. Frank Elliott, completely agreed. "I have been in the Air Force a long time," he said. "This crop of youngsters is the best yet. They are more responsive and responsible."

No fewer than one-quarter of the members of our armed services are under 20. Our generals and admirals agree they are the finest young fighting men this country has ever produced, as tough as their fathers of World War II and Korea, more alert and adaptable and so more fit to use the complex weapons of the space age.

September 14, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

22959

fact that raises two prospects, neither of them very pleasant. The first is that in order to attack the Vietcong, who terrorize and hide in the villages, the bombers will have to hurt the civil population in the villages even more. The second is that the Russians will put more and more antiaircraft weapons into this country and thus increase the casualties among American airmen and planes.

Incidentally, this problem illustrates another difference between American officials in Saigon and American officials in Washington. In Washington, officials are being very solicitous and understanding of the Russians. They are saying it is hard for the Russians to watch a Communist ally in North Vietnam being overwhelmed by American bombers, and, therefore, that we must expect Moscow to provide some defense against our air attacks.

In Saigon, however, American officials feel that the Russians are not only trying to help the Communists here, but are using this war as a testing ground for new weapons, as the Communists and the Nazis did in the Spanish Civil War in the 1930's.

Accordingly, while Washington talks about the possibility of Chinese intervention in the ground war, American officials here are even more concerned about the reality of Russian surface-to-air missiles, Russian fighters and Russian light bombers in the air war. Thus, the longer range prospect is not so good here. It raises several basic questions:

How will American opinion react to mounting casualties among our own fighter-bomber crews? And how will American opinion react if U.S. air attacks produce more and more casualties, not only among Communist Vietcong guerrillas, but among South Vietnamese civilians?

The dilemma is increasingly clear. On the one hand, there is almost no disagreement in Saigon, even among the French, that without the introduction of American bombers this war would probably have been lost already. But with the introduction of American air power, especially as used indiscriminately by the South Vietnamese forces, the danger of losing the people in the long run, even while winning the military war in the short run, is very real.

Two things may modify this U.S. problem of hurting our friends or potential friends in order to hurt our enemies. The first is that a great many of the air raids are not in densely populated areas. And the second is that the Vietnamese are a stoical people, who have suffered so much under the Mandarins, the French, the Japanese, and their own leaders in Saigon—which most Vietnamese regard as a remote and hostile center of authority and corruption—that they will probably endure punishment longer than anybody from the West might think possible.

Part of the reason for pessimism about the future beyond the immediate crisis is that South Vietnam does not really have a government that governs, or even an army that fights, in our sense of these terms. It is true that the Vietnamese have taken most of the casualties in the past year, but most of their 500,000-man army is either on defense or on reserve.

Premier Ky is very frank about it. He conceded the other day that his troops had been shelling and bombing the Vietcong because it was easier and safer for them to do so rather than go into the night and fight them on the ground. He concluded that his problem was to win the people by revolutionary programs while trying to win the war, but it is not at all clear that he will have the support of his military associates—and competitors—for such a policy.

In short, our generals here can deal, and are dealing for the moment, with the immediate military problems. And they are dealing with them rather better than their associates in Washington thought likely.

But behind the tactical and strategic military questions of the moment lie the occult immensities of the past—and these are not so easy either for the Americans in Saigon or for those in Washington. We do not really know how to deal effectively with a Government like this one. What Lord Curzon called the trail of the serpent lies over the curious collection of military sovereigns here. It is, Curzon said, "the vicious incubus of officialdom, paramount, selfish, domineering, and corrupt. Distrust of private enterprise is rooted in the mind trained up to believe that the Government is everything and the individual nothing."

He defined the oriental mind as meaning: "In character, a general indifference to truth and respect for successful wile; in deportment, dignity; in society, the rigid maintenance of the family union; in government, the mute acquiescence of the governed; in administration and justice, the open corruption of administrators and judges, and in everyday life, a statuesque and inexhaustible patience, which attaches no value to time, and wages unappeasable warfare against hurry."

Asia is moving, and the observations of the English aristocracy about this part of the world at the end of the Victorian era may not now be exact. But the fact is that our officials here in Saigon have run into a great deal of evidence that much of this is still true.

The Americans in Saigon have discovered that they can influence the course of the war, but the Americans in Washington have to deal with longer perspectives and are not at all sure that what they can influence they can control. Maybe this is what explains the greater optimism of American officials in Saigon: They have seen the power of America to influence the military situation. But they cannot control it without the support of the South Vietnamese Government and people, and so far they are not assured of either.

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY ON KING TURKEY DAY AT WORTHINGTON, MINN.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, on this last Saturday, Vice President Hubert Humphrey made a speech in Worthington, Minn., that is worthy of our very close and detailed attention. He made the point so well that in the United States our true task is to create a state and environment of equal opportunity where every man will have an equal chance to do something for himself and his fellowman. And he rightly emphasized that our fellowman lives not only in Worthington, Minn., not only in the United States, but in the entire expanse of this world.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Vice President's speech be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY ON TURKEY DAY, WORTHINGTON, MINN., SEPTEMBER 11, 1965

Thank you, Governor Rolvaag. I'm not surprised to see both you and Senator Mondale here today. King Turkey Day has always been a time when we politicians descend on Worthington.

I remember my first visit to Turkey Day. I literally descended on Worthington—in a light plane, and in bad weather. There were a few anxious moments, but we made it.

That was in 1948. I was mayor of Minne-

apolis and running as hard as I could for a seat in the U.S. Senate. Bad weather or not, I was coming to Turkey Day. I might add that my opponent, Joe Ball, didn't make it that Turkey Day. And he didn't make it that November either.

Since then, I've been to nearly a dozen King Turkey Days in Worthington. But none of them is as sharp in my memory as my first one.

When I came here in 1948, as a candidate for high public office, I did not talk about the turkey industry, or about Minnesota, or even about agriculture. I talked about the Marshall plan.

The Marshall plan was something important happening in 1948.

There were people then—and there are people today—saying that Worthington was not the place to talk about war and peace, about the great challenges facing Western man, about the moving tides of history.

But I said then—as I do today—that this is exactly the place.

For, in this nuclear age, Worthington is as close to Moscow, or to Cairo, or to Santiago, as my boyhood home was to Minneapolis. In fact, as I think about it, Minneapolis was even more distant to us then than those other places are today.

The time is past in this world—and we all know it—when what happens someplace else has nothing to do with us.

The Marshall plan had something to do with us in 1948. It revived Western Europe and helped make us secure from a very real and present danger. Korea had something to do with us. So did Hungary. So did Cuba.

So today do India and Pakistan and Vietnam. No one knows this better than the families in Worthington, and there are several of them, who have sons in Vietnam today. And, might I add, so today do Watts, Calif., and Harlem, N.Y., have something to do with us.

No man, no country can live in isolation. There was a time when we thought we could. Some of us can still remember it first hand.

We had prosperity in this country. And we decided to keep that pot of gold all for ourselves.

We wouldn't share with anybody.

We closed our immigration. We said: "We just don't want anymore of those foreigners, thank you."

We closed our trade. We said: "We don't want to do business with people abroad."

We closed our eyes and our minds to terrible things happening in the rest of the world—aggression, persecution, international bullying.

And it wasn't long 'til we closed our banks, and we closed our businesses, and our farms, and we opened up breadlines. We found ourselves in world depression and, then, Pearl Harbor.

When people turn selfishly inward, it's not a turn for the better. We do injustice to ourselves. And we lessen all men for what is less in us.

Today, in 1965, as Vice President of the United States, it is my privilege to return to Worthington to talk again about things that are important.

There are things being done in this Nation, and by this Nation, that are worth some of our time.

We Americans face great burdens ahead.

That is why we are building the great resources—both material and human resources—of this country to meet long, hard tasks at home and in the world.

We are trying to create an environment in this country where every single citizen will have the equal chance to do something for himself and for his fellowman. We seek to create a true state of opportunity.

There is no equal chance for the young man or woman, for the family, imprisoned in the ghettos and slums of urban America.

There is no equal chance for the American denied a life of choice because his skin is black, or because he has the wrong last name.

There is no equal opportunity for the school dropout—a boy or girl without skill—in a society which increasingly demands education and skill.

That is why we today are making great national investments to improve education, to defeat poverty, to remake our cities, to lift rural areas left behind, to give men and women their full constitutional rights.

The Job Corps camp is not a make-work project. It is nothing less than an effort to help young men learn how to make a living—to help them become taxpayers and not taxeaters.

Federal aid to education is not a means of exerting Federal control over towns and school districts, teachers and students. It is a way to bring better education to children living in places without enough money to pay for that education.

Yes, we are making basic, long-term investments in America and its people.

Our country is rich and prosperous. We can afford it. We can afford a strong national defense. We can afford billions of dollars to put a man on the moon and we can afford to help put a man on his feet right here on earth. Yes, today we help our neighbor. It is good economics. It is also right.

The Author Thomas Wolfe wrote it a generation ago. Today we work for it:

"To every man his chance, to every man regardless of his birth, his shining golden opportunity—to every man the right to live, to work, to be himself and to become whatever thing his manhood and his vision can combine to make him—this * * * is the promise of America."

And where will this strong and free America stand in the world?

Will we, as before, turn inward to keep what we have? Will we let the rest of the world go its own way—even if that way leads to disaster?

We must not and we will not.

We will not close the doors of our rich city until the less fortunate of the world are driven to storm its walls.

We will not stand idly by while the totalitarians and the takers of the world work their will by force on those unable to alone defend themselves.

And, we will not—living under the shadow of a great nuclear cloud—give up our search for a world of peace.

For peace is like a great cathedral. Each generation adds something to it. It requires the plan of a master architect. It requires the labors of many.

We will build peace with foreign aid. We will build peace with food for peace, with the Peace Corps, with technical assistance, with the Alliance for Progress in Latin America.

We will build peace with exchanges of people. We will build peace in the United Nations and in other international organizations. We will build peace at the conference table.

We will stand firm against those who would break or abuse the peace.

We will bend all our efforts so that our own great and terrible national military power need never be used.

Yes, we have things to talk about in 1965, just as we did in 1943.

We have the things that all men have in common: Our hopes for a freer and better life, for a chance to build something better for our children, for a world living in peace and in justice.

Let us work for the fulfillment of those hopes.

THE PTA UNDER ATTACK

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, in auditoriums and across living room

tables, a subtle war is being fought over how America's schools should be run. The weapons include innuendo, parliamentary maneuver and sometimes—violence.

This is a story told in the current issue of *Look* magazine in an article entitled, "The Plot to Take Over the PTA." It is the story of how an organization which has been working for good schools under local control is being undermined and its numbers reduced by a "takeover" plot of national proportions.

All those concerned about our schools will want to read this article. I would like to call it to the attention of the Senate by asking unanimous consent that it be printed in the *RECORD* at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

[From *Look* magazine, Sept. 7, 1965]

THE PLOT TO TAKE OVER THE PTA

(By Ernest Dunbar)

"We have to live with these people day in and day out, in all of our clubs and our schools and our children. Until you're in the middle of it, you don't realize what it entails."

The speaker was a housewife in Wheaton, Ill., a Chicago suburb. She was troubled, thinking back over incidents that seemed somehow like a bad dream and yet were part of a reality that had forced its way in upon her tranquil, tree-shaded world. The battlelines of an ugly, unheralded war began at her doorstep, and the opposing troops were neighbors, acquaintances, and onetime friends.

Who are "these people?" They are other American—superpatriots, self-appointed Paul Reveres, confused mothers, bewildered businessmen, professional "anti-Communists." Their stated goal: to rid America's schools of alleged Communist influences. Their intended vehicle: the local parent-teachers' association.

Would the Wheaton housewife talk to a *Look* reporter? Hesitantly, she agreed. What she had to say mirrored the anguish, the turmoil and strife that are becoming distressingly familiar in many school PTA's across these United States.

Her PTA had come under the domination of ultraconservative members of the community, and they had invited a traveling lecturer on anticommunism to address them in the high school auditorium. His talk shocked the mild mannered suburbanite. According to the speaker, most Federal officials in Washington do not believe in God or the Constitution, and are under the influence of a foreign Communist power; the State Department and the U.S. Supreme Court are being directed by the same Communist conspiracy; the news media of the country are dominated by Communists, and the United Nations exists solely for subverting the United States and other nations, and dragging them into one world government.

"I couldn't believe my ears," the housewife says. "What's worse was that everybody was sitting there nodding in agreement. There was almost no objection to anything this man said," she recalls. Later, during the discussion period, when she questioned the accuracy of some of the lecturer's statements, "there were people glaring at me and muttering, and frankly, I felt afraid."

Late one evening, 2 weeks after this incident, two men tried to force their way into her home while her husband was out of town. They said they had come to have it out with her because of her opposition to the conservative direction taken by the local

PTA unit. The men left only after she threatened to call for help.

Last winter, in St. Augustine, Fla., before an important meeting of a high school PTA, the chairman of the local (white) Citizens Council, a segregationist organization, took his PTA membership card to a printer and had 500 counterfeit cards made in order to pack the meeting with his non-PTA supporters. Not only did another council member ask the PTA president to sign the bogus membership cards (the request was rejected), but the printing bill for the fake cards was sent to PTA.

At Portland, Oreg., Wilson High earlier this year, the PTA scheduled a series of speakers on civil rights to coincide with a study project being conducted by the school's students. One of the talks was given by J. Belton Hamilton, a Negro assistant attorney general of Oregon. The committee of parents that had arranged the meeting reported numerous phone calls were received which labeled the speaker, the principal, and the PTA president as Communist and put unusual pressure on us to have a speaker representing their special interests. The report said that those responsible for the pressures "have taken their action in the name of patriotism and Americanism."

Last year, in Upper Saddle River, N.J., a well-to-do New York City suburb, businessman Jerry Schlossberg, vice president of the Edith Bogert School PTA, was selected by a nomination committee to become president. In that PTA, the vice president usually succeeds the outgoing president. Then things took an untraditional turn. Schlossberg says a telephone campaign spread the word around town that he, Schlossberg, a member of a local fair-housing group, was going to bring some Negro families into the all-white community. Three days before the election, a meeting was held in the home of Mrs. Ordeen Knight, Schlossberg's nomination was withdrawn and a substitute slate headed by Mrs. Knight put up. Some board members later asserted that Schlossberg lacked the "temperament" for the job.

After the election of Mrs. Knight as president of the Bogert School PTA, a local newspaper revealed that both she and the new vice president were members of the extremist John Birch Society.

In North Hollywood, Calif., PTA members at the Victory Boulevard Elementary School prepared to put on their third annual skit to raise money for school activities. Fifty parents and the school principal, Francis Williams, were to take part in the program, which they had been rehearsing for 3 months. Shortly before the play was to open, one Victory Boulevard School parent objected to a show that spoofed George Washington, Benjamin Franklin, and other historical figures. News of the objection appeared in the press, and the principal began receiving telephone calls from people who were not in PTA and had no children in the school. One caller warned him that the show must be canceled "if you want to see daylight tomorrow."

Williams submitted the script to the two most conservative members of the Los Angeles City Board of Education, who did not oppose his going ahead with the show. After the first of four scheduled performances of the "Victory Boulevard Follies," a powerful bomb was set off in the restaurant owned by Konrad Schloss, one of the authors of the controversial skit. School authorities, fearing for the safety of the children, canceled the remaining three performances. The \$500 that the parents had hoped to raise for the school fund was lost.

What's happening in the PTA? In airy kitchens, high-school auditoriums, over living room tables and on sun-swept patios across the Nation, a shadowy but frequently vicious war is being fought. The stakes are the minds of American-schoolchildren.

The antagonists are housewives, principals, teachers, physicians, school board members, and veterans leaders. They range

With the least money. Nobody has ever objected to this, the primary function of the Budget Bureau. And it is an enormous and responsible job.

But all of this is an advisory and coordinating job.

The power to see to it that the laws that are enacted are, or are not, carried out, does not go with an advisory job.

The power to alter the details of the work of other agencies so as to alter the effect of the law does not go with it.

The power to censor the agencies of Government so that they may tell Congress only what the Budget Bureau permits them to does not go with it. Any agency should be permitted to tell the Congress anything it wants to, and the Budget Bureau should then be permitted to testify that it disagrees with such agency, so that Congress can have the facts on both sides.

We have seen that the Budget Bureau is not above telling Congress what laws it should and should not pass, not as mere testimony, but with threats of getting a Presidential veto in some cases, or simply declining to spend the money (or permitting it to be requested) to carry out a law that may be enacted by Congress over the Bureau's objection.

Because the Bureau was made an arm of the President himself, it easily looks upon itself as the President speaking. Unlike Presidents, the career staff of the Bureau doesn't stand for election every 4 years. Presidents of both parties and Budget Directors come and go while the career staff stays on. It stays on under Republican and Democratic Presidents, giving orders to and making decisions for Republican and Democratic Cabinet Departments and lesser agencies under secretaries who come and go, and wielding the political power of succeeding Presidents in Congress.

This is heady medicine indeed—a temptation to an exercise of power which the Constitution sought to avoid above all else. It makes of the Budget Bureau a disembodied, unelected, permanent super President of the United States. The same men spoke for Truman and Eisenhower and Kennedy who are speaking for Lyndon Johnson today. Had Barry Goldwater been elected they would have been speaking for him. Presidents themselves shrink in stature beside this silent, secretive organ of continuing power. Small wonder that the Budget Bureau is seen by many as the invisible Government of the United States. Small wonder that Lyndon Johnson, as majority leader of the Senate, cried out "by what authority?" and got no answer.

The Budget Bureau is needed—back in its former position as a potent advisor whose estimates and counsel on income and expenditures should be heard with respect. But it should be divested of all powers—actual and sub-rosa—to be the enforcer of its own policies in both the executive and legislative branches of a Government that is supposed to be representative of the people. By making the Budget Bureau an arm of the President, too much power was delegated to a continuing group of men who are not politically answerable to the people of a Republic. President Johnson will have no power to speak for his successor as President, but the career men in the Budget Bureau who now speak for him will speak for the next President, and the next, and the next.

"The Bureau of the Budget has usurped the constitutional powers of Congress for decades," declares Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH, of Texas. "The Budget Bureau has gone far beyond its proper and constitutional place in Government by the arbitrary exercise of powers not properly granted to the Executive. I would be in favor of abolishing it as it now exists and replacing it with another agency to coordinate rather than to command.

"It's really dangerous," says YARBOROUGH. "It's not safe for the country. The Founding Fathers: Washington, Jefferson, Madison, and the others who framed our Government, set up a Constitution of checks and balances. The Founding Fathers learned from the experience of centuries that the average man would fare better with a diffusion of power in Government.

"If, under the guise of being economical, the Budget Bureau refuses to spend money appropriated by Congress to carry out the laws enacted by Congress, the balance of constitutional powers is destroyed. And that is precisely what has happened over the past several decades.

"Congress must some day face up to the problem by abolishing the Bureau of the Budget and setting up something else in its stead. It is the duty of the Congress to have the nerve and the drive and the energy to go back and recapture its constitutional powers. Some day it will."

HUMAN SUFFERING IN SOUTH VIETNAM EMPHASIZES THE IMPORTANCE OF INCREASING MEDICAL AID

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, our military effort in Vietnam seems to be slowly but steadily improving.

And yet we may lose the peace. We may lose the support of the people of South Vietnam simply because their suffering has become unbearable.

Last Sunday Dr. Howard Rusk, the eminent New York Times medical correspondent, reported the heartbreaking story of sickness and death in Vietnam.

He also described in detail the pathetic lack of doctors, of hospitals, and medicines. These are shortages we are working desperately to solve. It is vital that we do even better—in fact far better in the future—if we are to win the hearts and minds of these long-suffering people, and that is the key to genuine victory in Vietnam.

I ask unanimous consent that the article by Dr. Rusk, "Refugee in Vietnam," be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REFUGEE CRISIS IN VIETNAM—CONSTANT SHIFTING OF HOMELESS MAKES DIFFICULT JOB ALMOST INSURMOUNTABLE

(By Howard A. Rusk, M.D.)

SAIGON.—Only by seeing can one believe the extent and depth of human suffering in Vietnam.

The Complexities of relieving suffering in this war-ravaged nation are incredible. They would be insurmountable were it not for the programs already established by the U.S. forces, both military and civilian, international voluntary agencies and other groups from the free world.

Of the 15 million people in Vietnam, 600,000 or 1 in 15 are refugees. This is the second time in the brief history of the Republic of Vietnam that the uprooting of lives has reached enormous proportions.

In 1954 and 1955, following the partition of Vietnam, almost 1 million refugees left the Communist north because of political and religious beliefs. Only 140,000, primarily elements of Ho Chi Minh's army, moved from the south to Communist North Vietnam.

The situation today, however, is completely different from 10 years ago. At that time there was a clear line of demarcation between the forces of communism and democracy.

LAND OF ISOLATION

Now South Vietnam resembles a large lake dotted with numerous islands. The "water" portion is the Vietcong and the "islands" the secure and semisecure territory of the Vietnamese. As the tide of battle fluctuates, these islands increase or decrease in size.

When the islands decrease the rural population seeks refuge in the secure territories and, as a result, the refugee population swells. As the government and U.S. forces counterattack and regain territory the refugees return to their farms and hamlets.

When the United States and Vietnam marines began a combined air and amphibious offensive in the coastal lowlands at Cape Batangan, about 340 miles northeast of here recently, the refugee population of nearby secure areas increased rapidly. Leaflets are dropped in advance of an attack to warn the civilian population to seek safety.

The current influx of refugees results from the increased Vietcong terrorism and confiscatory taxation, and increased Vietnam and United States military operations.

Refugees are almost 100 percent women, children, and older men practically all of the country's men of working age are in its armed forces. Primarily farmers, the refugees have no other skills and are dependent upon the government and the U.S. Agency for International Development.

In theory, the government provides each adult refugee with seven plasters a day (about 5 cents) and three plasters a day for a child. With the rising prices, resulting from shortages of commodities, it has become increasingly necessary for the United States to provide the refugees with supplementary food. Distribution of food, which comes from U.S. surplus stocks, presents an extraordinarily difficult logistical problem because the secure areas are isolated.

RAIL TRANSPORT OUT

There is no rail transport because the Vietcong have destroyed all railway bridges. When wood and other supplies become depleted, the government has to deploy thousands of its troops to clear a highway through Vietcong territory and then has to keep it open for the long truck convoys. In many areas, the only communication with the outside world for months has been by airlift.

Food and its delivery is the No. 1 problem for Vietnam's refugees and its provincial population. The second major problem is health. Vietnam has about 900 physicians, most of who are in the military service. In one secure area, which last week had a population of about 300,000 persons, there are only 4 physicians, all of whom are in the military service and must meet the civilian health needs on a part-time basis.

Tuberculosis is highly prevalent, as are skin infections, intestinal parasites, trachoma, and other diseases of the eyes, typhoid, and leprosy. A remarkably good job has been done by Vietnamese and United States health workers in controlling serious epidemics among the refugees by inoculations against smallpox, cholera, plague, and typhoid.

In vast areas of the country the only health services are medicines distributed by U.S. military teams. These are not special medical units but regular forces, all of whom carry medicines to distribute to the civilian population, especially refugees.

Added to the health problems of an uprooted population are the ravages of conflict. This writer saw the effects of the war on a visit to Mytho, a provincial capital in the lush Mekong Delta. Mytho is 30 minutes from here by helicopter over Vietcong territory. There had been heavy fighting the night before in the area. Refugees were just beginning to struggle in with their wounded.

The most touching of all was a frantic mother with a 3-year-old child, a large portion of whose face had been destroyed by Vietcong land mines. She had walked 11

September 14, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

22967

and patients—anything with a canceled postage stamp.

And personal contacts with veterans, instead of being 6,506 were 40,008. They came not to 2.3 percent of the total contacts with veterans, but more than 66 percent.

Similar committees in other parts of the country reported the same discrepancies with respect to justifications of VA closings in their areas.

This incredible situation concerning public responsibility is not like the usually meticulous Veterans' Administration. It is like the wriggling of a Government agency under orders from the Bureau of the Budget to cut back its operation with a tough command to make the cutback look good.

On the surface it looks like insanity for the Budget Bureau to force the VA to close offices when the reputed savings are only myth. But it makes sinister sense when you recall the Budget Bureau's desire not to have veterans claim what has already been awarded them by Congress. Intensive studies by both the VA and the House Committee on Veterans Affairs have revealed that veterans who have been eligible for millions of dollars of vets benefits didn't claim them because they did not understand the law in spite of VA mail in governmentese explaining it to them. In this light, the hanky-panky unveiled at Fargo (only one of 16 regional offices that were proposed to be closed) to force more veterans to use the mail suggests that the Budget Bureau sees the real savings to lie in unclaimed benefits if services to veterans are withdrawn hundreds of miles.

The outcry at this sort of thing resulted in President Johnson taking the matter out of the hands of the VA and the Budget Bureau and referring the VA closings to a special Presidential committee. On June 9, the closing order was rescinded for Fargo and seven other regional offices, for two of the soldiers homes and five of the hospitals. This was clearly a compromise of a situation in which his own Budget Bureau had embarrassed the President. Six hospitals, caring for 11,500 patients; eight regional offices, and two soldiers homes remained on the list to be closed unless Congress should specifically legislate their continuance, as it has sometimes done in the past. To a number of bills already proposed to prevent further arbitrary closings at the whim of the Budget Bureau, the House Veterans Affairs Committee promptly added another (H.R. 202) to restrict either the closing or adding of VA hospitals and homes in the future without approval of the committee. So much for a sampling of the Budget Bureau's operation in veterans affairs.

Fear is one of the weapons by which the Bureau of the Budget enforces its dominance. "It is common knowledge," former Senator Dennis Chavez, of New Mexico, once remarked, "that most Government agencies are scared green of the Budget Bureau."

The gagging of high Government officials in testimony before Congress goes right to the heart of the American system of representative government. It is a form of controlled ignorance of the people's representatives.

Nor is this confined to verbal testimony. The Budget Bureau controls the content of letters sent by agencies to Congress and of letters sent by independent agencies to the President. It censors the mail in both of these channels by demanding that whatever such agency heads write must be submitted to them for approval, disapproval or alteration. The Congress seeks a written appraisal on virtually every bill before it, from the agency that the bill would come under. But if any agency head has a different opinion from that of the Budget Bureau, it is out of the letter before a congressional committee sees it.

The Member of Congress who, over a period of many years, has been the Budget Bureau's most persistent critic on Capitol Hill is Representative DANIEL FLOOD, of Pennsylvania. Flood has referred to the Budget Bureau as a menace to the general welfare and has, along with numerous other Members of Congress, often introduced bills to abolish it in its present form.

Flood was the author of a stinging attack on the Bureau when he charged in 1959 that it had made groveling, heelclicking, faceless wonders of the Department of Defense witnesses before the Armed Services and Appropriations Committees of Congress. "No wonder Gen. James Gavin, Gen. Matthew Ridgway and other civilian and military leaders in the Department of Defense will not stomach this regimentation," Flood said angrily on the House floor.

Representative FLOOD created a sensation when he read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a confidential memorandum (obtained by means not publicly stated) addressed to the then Secretary of Defense, Neil McElroy, by the then Budget Director, Maurice H. Stans. It reads very much like the orders of a tough top sergeant passing down the word to the troops:

"It is expected," Stans wrote to the Secretary of Defense, "that witnesses (before congressional committees) will carefully avoid volunteering views differing from the budget, either on the record or off the record. While direct questions at hearings must be answered frankly, it is expected that a witness who feels that he must set forth a personal view inconsistent with the President's budget will point out that the President's judgment on the matter was reached from his overall perspective as head of the Government and in the light of overriding national policy. The witness should make it clear that his personal comments are not a request for additional funds.

"Please see that a reminder of this reaches all officials and employees who participate in hearings on appropriations and on legislation directly related to budget proposals."

Not everyone was gagged, but they didn't have their way either. The Congressional Quarterly published the names of numerous able Americans who had quit the Government service in rebellion against the invisible Budget Bureau rather than support policies to which they were opposed, with gags in their mouths. At the same time the Quarterly listed a host of charges that had been made against the Bureau.

Adm. Hyman Rickover said it had withheld "funds to design nuclear power plants to keep submarines under water indefinitely." The outspoken father of our nuclear subs declared, "They should either release the funds or cancel the project."

The head of the National Bureau of Standards charged that the Budget Bureau had held up funds for missile research. The Army Research Director said that weapons development was lagging because too many budget experts were trying to run the Army research program. Representative CHER HOLIFIELD said there'd been a clear substitution of the judgment of the Budget Bureau for Atomic Energy Commission experts at the Hanford, Wash., plutonium project. Senator CLINTON ANDERSON said the Budget Bureau had slowed rocket development by impounding \$9.1 million appropriated for Project Rover, and that it had drafted the President's space agency bill and given interested agencies only 24 hours' notice before submitting it to Congress. Senator MIKE MANSFIELD said that the Bureau had frozen \$22 million of \$32 million appropriated for the National Guard.

To the Stans letter, Representative FLOOD commented acidly:

"The Bureau of the Budget is a Frankenstein insofar as the legislative processes of Congress are concerned. It proposes and

discloses as this group of glorified clerks directs. The Budget Bureau is making policy on the minute, on the hour, on the day. It is torturing beyond all reason what Congress meant when it created the Bureau."

Such intimate glimpses into the inner exercise of power by the Bureau of the Budget do not come to light often. You do not see television programs or magazine articles on the Budget Bureau—and the only newspaper comments you are likely to see are brief, routine announcements such as that of the recent replacement of Budget Director Kermit Gordon by Charles L. Schultze, a 40-year-old Maryland University economics professor.

The late Senator Thomas Hennings, of Missouri, counted by many as the most scholarly constitutional lawyer to sit in Congress for decades, was upset about the Budget Bureau's muzzling of witnesses before congressional committees:

"Congress," Senator Hennings said, "ought to have access to opinions and facts from Government officials to carry out its own serious responsibilities to the people." He read to his fellow Senators a short, sharply pointed editorial from the Columbia Missourian re: the Budget Bureau's gagging of witnesses:

"Budget Bureau spokesmen denied that this (the Stans letter) was intended as a gag on prospective witnesses. But if it was not this, what was it?"

"It is the duty of Congress to make appropriations, and in carrying out this duty, it should have all possible sources of information. The most natural sources of information are Government officials. Congressmen must try to find out whether or not their requests are justified."

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana, now the majority leader, has questioned the constitutionality of the powers exercised by the Budget Bureau.

"Congress," he said frankly, "faces a constitutional problem which we will have to meet some day if we do not want to see our (lawmaking) power steadily eroded and our constitutional position as a coequal branch of the Government reduced still further." The constitutional problem still has not been faced.

The Bureau was established in 1921 after a dozen years of hassle on Capitol Hill. But it did not become really controversial until the late 1930's, when Franklin D. Roosevelt proposed to reorganize it, vastly enlarge its powers, and put it in the Executive Office of the President.

Republican Members of Congress bounced up an' down of the Capitol Dome at the very thought of that. Capital Hill resounded with anguished cries that Roosevelt wanted to become a dictator. Enough Democrats joined in opposing the move so that it was defeated in Congress. An angry F.D.R. from the little White House in Warm Springs, Ga., wrote his famous "Dear John" open letter in which he denied that he possessed the talent or inclination to become a dictator.

Finally, F.D.R. got his way. The bill passed. On September 9, 1939, Reorganization Plan No. 1 for 1939 made the Budget Bureau a part of the President's staff.

With the recasting of the Bureau as a private arm of the President, its Director beyond congressional confirmation, the Bureau became a storm center and has been one ever since.

What went wrong?

Both the Congress, and President, and all the agencies, badly need a budget bureau to estimate how much income the Government may have from any and all revenue sources, and how much the various old programs and new programs entertained by the Congress, the President, and the agencies will cost. Such a bureau is also needed to suggest ways and means of doing the most

September 14, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

22969

kilometers (nearly 7 miles) through Vietcong territory to find help for her child. Other casualties included amputees and a 12-year-old boy with hundreds of skin wounds, who was blinded by a Vietcong land mine.

COULD BE REHABILITATED

There was an outstanding team of Philippine surgeons in the provincial hospital, which, like many hospitals in Vietnam, had two patients in most of its beds. There are numerous Philippine and other free world groups working in health activities among the Vietnamese civilian population.

Particularly distressing to this writer was the problem of the paraplegic veterans. Most of them have been collected at one center, which is a 2-hour drive from Saigon through Vietcong territory. The authorities, having had no experience in the modern management of paraplegia and no personnel trained to meet the complicated problems of this condition, are helpless.

These men are excellent candidates for rehabilitation, but unless they receive outside help quickly they are doomed.

Vietnam is a political struggle with violent military overtones. It is a Vietnamese war, which must be won by the Vietnamese with our support. It is a war that can be lost in Saigon, but can only be won in the countryside. It is a war with hundreds of pressing needs in the fields of health, education, and welfare.

The solutions to these problems have political as well as humanitarian implications. The Vietnamese peasant wants security, food, social justice, and a better life for his children than he has had. He has a great yearning for education for his children. He will cast his lot with the political system under which he thinks his chances are best for the achievement of his aspirations.

Failure of the United States and the free world to provide sufficient help to the Republic of Vietnam to make these aspirations a reality could result in our winning the war but losing the peace.

RICHARD NIXON IS OFF BASE

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, by making inflammatory statements during his recent trip to the Far East, Richard Nixon has done a distinct disservice to our Government's goal of a peaceful settlement in southeast Asia. Some of the Nation's most responsible newspapers, including the New York Times on September 8, and the Lewiston Morning Tribune on August 29, have condemned Mr. Nixon's statements. As Bill Hall noted in the Lewiston Morning Tribune:

Former Vice President Richard Nixon, currently on a tour of the Far East, is taking astounding liberties in announcing what this Nation's policies should be and will be in the Vietnamese war. He is showing no regard for the fact he is a distinguished former high official in the U.S. Government, and that many in the Far East may take his words for more than the idle comments of another American tourist.

I ask unanimous consent to have these two excellent editorials printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Sept 8, 1965]

NIXON OFF BASE

Richard M. Nixon's 16-day tour of Asia, described as a "private business trip," has been accompanied by public statements at every stop calling for "victory" in Vietnam and denouncing proposals for peace negotia-

tions. In a Saigon news conference, the former Vice President said the Republican Party would make a campaign issue out of Vietnam in 1966 and 1968 if President Johnson ended the war there by compromise.

The propriety of carrying an American political debate abroad, doubtful in any circumstances, is even more questionable when controversial statements concerning a war situation are emitted from a platform in the war zone itself. But the issue raised by Mr. Nixon's remarks—which oppose a settlement based on concessions by both sides—is far more important than the unfortunate location he chose for the purpose.

The idea that unconditional surrender can be imposed on North Vietnam is an illusion that most Americans long since have abandoned. President Johnson has recognized that military victory is impossible for either side. He has accompanied military pressure with proposals that offer North Vietnam a way out of the present impasse.

The effect of the President's proposals on the nonaligned countries—and on Moscow and Hanoi—seems to have Communist China worried. Peiping in recent weeks has felt it necessary to urge Hanoi to fight on. But the Chinese leaders are evidently unable to offer anymore solid encouragement than the will-o'-the-wisp hope that other "liberation wars" in Asia, Africa, and Latin America ultimately will help the Vietnamese Communists defeat the United States.

In these circumstances, Mr. Nixon's remarks can only be tragically harmful, encouraging an unrealistic intransigence just at the moment when a vital debate seems to be going on within the Communist world.

[From the Lewiston (Idaho) Morning Tribune, Aug. 29, 1965]

WE READ YOU—LOUD AND MISTAKEN

Secretary of State Dean Rusk proclaimed knowingly Friday that he is keeping his "antenna * * * very much alert" for peace signals from the Communists. If he had tuned to another frequency Saturday he would have heard, not a peace overture, but a symphony in saber rattling. And it came not from Hanoi, Peiping, or Moscow war rooms. The transmitter was a former Vice President of the United States.

Former Vice President Richard Nixon, currently on a tour of the Far East, is taking astounding liberties in announcing what this Nation's policies should be and will be in the Vietnamese war. He is showing no regard for the fact he is a distinguished former high official in the U.S. Government, and that many in the Far East may take his words for more than the idle comments of another American tourist.

Stopping in Japan, Nixon told the residents of Tokyo that the Communists "have slapped us in the face with a wet fish" after each U.S. peace offer, and that Communists misinterpret a willingness to negotiate "as a sign of weakness." Constant talk of negotiation has actually prolonged the war, he said.

And at Taipei, Formosa, Nixon declared that the Communists know the Republic of China will attack the mainland if they intervene in Vietnam. He said not only that the Communists know that, but, in the event of such intervention, "there would certainly be justification for the Chinese Nationalists to counterattack the Chinese Communists."

In one busy day, a former Vice President of the United States has announced to the world that the search for peace in Vietnam is a sign of weakness, and he has given his blessing in advance to a Nationalist Chinese attack on mainland China.

The Communists may know that the Nationalists will attack the mainland if they intervene in Vietnam, but one wonders if the President of the United States knows it.

Perhaps that is a possibility being considered by the Johnson administration in the

event of Red Chinese intervention, but that is a decision to be made when the time comes by the Commander in Chief, the Secretary of Defense and the Joint Chiefs of Staff. It is not a course to be proclaimed as fact by an itinerant American politician.

It is one of the blessings of U.S. citizenship that any American can become an expert on foreign policy and tell the President and the world what we should do in Vietnam. But no one, and especially a man of such stature that he might be believed by many abroad, has the right to announce whether we will or will not invite the Formosan Chinese to apply counterpressure against the mainland.

Even when Nixon only discusses what the United States should do, rather than what it will do, his declaration is incompatible coming from a man who once sought to become Commander in Chief himself. To suggest that attempts at peacemaking are wrong because they will be misinterpreted as signs of weakness is preposterous.

There would seem to be a faint possibility that they might be interpreted as signs of peaceful intent.

Right or wrong, the U.S. policy in South Vietnam should by now be crystal clear to the Red Chinese, the North Vietnamese, the Russians, our allies, the American people, and even former Vice Presidents. Johnson, Rusk and practically every member of the Cabinet has stated on countless occasions that the American and Vietnamese forces will maintain the pressure on the Vietcong and North Vietnam making it clear that there is no weakness of resolve of military force.

At the same time, it has been explained time and time again, we remain ready to talk peace whenever the Vietcong, the North Vietnamese, the United Nations or anyone else is ready to talk peace. Meanwhile, American forces engage the Vietcong, and American bombers pound the north. It's a strange way to demonstrate weakness.

It is easy to understand the President's frequent exasperation over his foreign policy critics. No matter what he does, he is wrong. If he prosecutes the war to vigorously, he is wrong for not seeking more avenues to peace. If he offers to negotiate, he is showing signs of weakness.

In the meantime, however, the President continues to put the weight of action behind the words of policy. The pressure on the Vietcong is being increased, and the attempts to find a peaceful solution are becoming ever more intensive. American troops continue to be sent to Vietnam in ever-increasing numbers, and Rusk reports he is under orders to seek out every possible road to peace. There are, in fact, dozens of attempts now underway through Moscow, through the United Nations and through a flock of other third parties.

And through it all, Rusk keeps his antennae alert. Hopefully, he soon will pick up more than the static transmitted from Tokyo and Taipei Saturday.

THE VOLUNTARY FEED GRAIN PROGRAM

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, it would be difficult to overstate the importance of continuing the national feed grain program through the next 4 years.

The feed grain program is a tremendous success. Over two-thirds of all the farmers in the United States have feed grain bases, growing one or more of the three grains primarily used for livestock and poultry feeding, corn, barley, and sorghum grains.

Corn and the other feed grains are used for human consumption, for the

22970

feeding of dairy cows, for the feeding and fattening of beef cattle, hogs, chickens, and turkeys, for cash export, and for many industrial uses. Feed grains either accounted for or had a direct bearing on over \$3 of every \$5 received by all American farmers in 1964.

It should be continued because it has proved to be a success and because the trend of success can be continued.

Also, it should be continued because the alternative would be extremely bad for farmers and bad for the Nation.

First, let us look at the success story.

During the past 4 years, it has chalked up these achievements:

First. It has increased producer income. Producers have realized \$3 billion more for their crops than would have been possible under pre-1961 programs. In Minnesota alone, continuation of this program will mean an additional \$21 million in farm income next year, increasing feed grains returns to \$534 million.

Second. It has reduced the surplus. This fall the combined carryover of feed grains will be down more than 1 billion bushels from the 3.2 billion bushel peak in 1960.

The program has also saved money for the taxpayer in the long run. For example, in 1960, CCC stocks of feed grains, stored at the taxpayers' expense totaled some 85 million tons. The 1961-64 programs reduced that amount from 85 million tons to 56 million tons, at a substantial saving to the Government. USDA experts say that had this program not been law, stocks would otherwise have continued to increase to 125 million tons, costing the American taxpayer increased storage and handling and transportation costs.

Third. It has cut Government costs. Government outlays, though large under the program, ultimately would have been more than \$2 billion greater under the pre-1961 program.

The cost to the Government per harvested acre has been, for example, for feed grains only \$11 per acre, as compared to \$34 per acre for cotton, \$41 for wheat, and \$101 for rice. On a per farm basis, the results are even more revealing. Feed grains, per farm, cost the Government an average of \$436 per farm, while cotton went to \$626 per farm, wheat \$1,109, and rice slightly under \$1,240.

But in any way that costs can be analyzed, it is the most efficient, the most economical, and the most beneficial to the farmer of any of the other major commodity programs.

Fourth. It has promoted foreign sales. Feed grain exports have expanded rapidly in recent years and are a major dollar earner without need of Government export payments.

Fifth. It has brought stability into grain markets and the livestock industry. The pressure of climbing surpluses and lower prices under pre-1961 programs would have extended through the entire agricultural economy with particularly serious implications for the multi-billion dollar livestock and poultry industry.

The alternative to an effective feed grain program is disaster. Without a feed grain program, the acreage of feed grains would go up around 30 to 35 million acres the first year. Farmers would inevitably produce an extra 40 to 50 million tons of feed grains that we cannot use now. This extra feed grain would mean millions of extra hogs or billions of pounds of additional beef.

Mr. President, the majority of the Senate committee reviewed the facts that I have just mentioned concerning the success of this program, and I think it is fair to state the consensus was that this is the first truly successful feed grain program that we have ever had in the history of farm legislation and farm programs.

Time after time I have heard farmers from my own State of Minnesota, sometimes even those who were not participants in the feed grain program, say that this is the best program they have ever had made available to them. They appreciate most of all that it has helped bring about stability in livestock supplies and in livestock prices. For many producers, this is why we have a feed grain program—to promote stability with reasonable supplies in the livestock economy.

Minnesota's feed grain crop is crucial to the health of our agricultural sector, for although as a cash crop it accounts for only 13.6 percent of Minnesota marketing receipts, it is grown on 85 percent of our farms, and is fed on farms to cattle, hogs, calves, poultry, and dairy cows, which together account for almost 70 percent of Minnesota's marketing receipts.

And Minnesota's farmers participate in the Government programs. 71 percent of our farmers signed up, compared to the nationwide average of 36 percent, and the loss of that program would mean to those farmers an immediate drop in income in excess of \$45 million. It can readily be seen what such a loss would do to the State of Minnesota. And this would be true for many other States having a high participation rate in the voluntary feed grains program.

I am not talking about the large commercial farmer. Studies of Minnesota reveal that in our 42 principal feed grain counties, an average of 80 percent of the payments made by the Government went to cooperating producers with a base acreage of 200 acres or less. In some of those counties, this figure goes as high as 96 or 97 percent.

Basically, the feed grain program included in the omnibus farm bill now before the Senate is a continuation of the successful program we now have. Production needs to be compared with utilization to provide any meaningful measure of the program's success. Total stocks have been cut about 30 million tons during the first 4 years of the program. It is clear, therefore, that the program has been successful in reducing production substantially below the level of utilization. In contrast, during the 1950's, increases in utilization were more than offset by increases in production.

But the committee recognized that as

productivity goes up, the basic price relationships of these grains must be reviewed. We recognize that in the last 6 years corn yields have increased nearly 33 percent—from 54.5 bushels per acre in 1960 to an estimated 72.4 bushels per acre in 1965. About the same percentage increase occurred in the preceding 6 years. We are advised this increase in productivity—in yields—is likely to continue in the foreseeable future—certainly in the 4 years covered by this new bill—and we must, therefore, recognize that the price support rate must take into account the changes in technology and productivity that are occurring. We have done that, Mr. President, by providing the authority for the Secretary of Agriculture to modify the components of total support available to the cooperators. We have provided that total support must be in the range of 85 to 90 percent of parity. Under present conditions, this would be \$1.03 to \$1.42 per bushel for corn.

In the bill, as well as in the report, the committee has indicated that the Secretary of Agriculture should take into account these changes in determining the levels of the loan and, therefore, the level of the price support payment. I believe I am accurate in stating that a majority of the members of the committee do not mean in any way to force the Secretary of Agriculture to reduce the basic loan level in a manner which would be disruptive to the livestock economy. There were suggestions presented in the committee that this be done by statute so as to drop 1 nickel per year for each of the 4 years involved with the feed grain program. This was not accepted by the majority of the committee. Instead, we preferred to give the authority to the Secretary of Agriculture to take into account—and I quote from H.R. 9811 now pending before the Senate, on page 78, line 10: "taking into account increases in yields, but"—and now I emphasize, Mr. President: "but so as not to disrupt the feed grain and livestock economy."

Also, I believe I am correct in stating that a majority of the committee—being interested in maintaining farm income of cooperators—wanted to be sure that any reduction in the loan rate would not be accompanied by a reduction in total support paid to the participating feed grain farmer. We look for improvement, not diminishment, of feed grain farmer income.

In summary, the majority of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry are saying to the Secretary and administrators of this program: "We recognize that rapid changes are taking place, we recognize that there may need to be modifications in the mix of price support loan and price support payments in order to get the best results of the feed grain program in the years ahead, but in making your decisions we want it clear that you shall take into consideration the effects of any new loan levels on supplies, and therefore, returns to producers involved in feed grain and livestock production.

We do not intend that the Secretary of Agriculture should reduce, for exam-